

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

mitt

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Viginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/909,505	07/20/2001	Gilson Woo		4913
7	590 05/08/2003			
GILSON WOO			EXAMINER	
19708 BALAN ROWLAND H	ROAD EIGHTS, CA 91748		VENIAMINOV, NIKITA R	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3736	0/
			DATE MAILED: 05/08/2003	8

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			FAA		
•		Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Office Action Summary		09/909,505	WOO, GILSON		
		Examiner	Art Unit		
		Nikita R Veniaminov	3736		
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication a or Reply	ppears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address		
THE I - Exter after - If the - If NO - Failu - Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION is sions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR six (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reperiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perior to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statically received by the Office later than three months after the mailed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	I. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a eply within the statutory minimum of thi d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MOI ute, cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed rty (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. & 133).		
1)🖂	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17	7 March 2003 .			
2a)⊠	This action is FINAL . 2b)	This action is non-final.			
3) 🗌	Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice unde on of Claims	wance except for formal ma er <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.	tters, prosecution as to the merits is D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.		
•	Claim(s) <u>1-32</u> is/are pending in the applicati	on			
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdr				
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.	awii iioiii consideration.			
	Claim(s) <u>1-32</u> is/are rejected.				
_	Claim(s) is/are objected to.				
8)	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and on Papers	or election requirement.			
	The specification is objected to by the Examir	ner.			
	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc		he Examiner		
	Applicant may not request that any objection to				
11) 🔲 🛭	he proposed drawing correction filed on	* ' '	` ,		
	If approved, corrected drawings are required in r	reply to this Office action.			
12) 🔲 🏾	he oath or declaration is objected to by the E	xaminer.			
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120				
13)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig	gn priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).		
_	☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) None of:				
	1. Certified copies of the priority documer	nts have been received.			
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No				
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the pri application from the International B ee the attached detailed Office action for a lis	Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	_		
	cknowledgment is made of a claim for domes				
a)	☐ The translation of the foreign language p cknowledgment is made of a claim for domes	rovisional application has b	een received.		
Attachment	(s)				
2) Notice 3) Inform	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5) Notice of	Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)		
S. Patent and Tra TO-326 (Rev		Action Summary	Part of Paper No. 8		

Art Unit: 3736

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: The phrase "region" in line 8 should read "regions". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
- 3. Claims 1-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lopez et al. (US 5,720,046) in view of Woo (US 5,529,569). Lopez et al. ('046) teach a method of treating and alleviating afflictions, ailments and diseases holistically by application of magnetism to a plurality of treating regions of the trunk, hands, head and neck (see abstract, Figures 3-5, 12, 14, 16a-16c and 19a), the method comprising designating a total treating region; providing magnet means having at least one north pole surface adapted for application to the plurality of treating regions of the trunk (see Figure 12 and column 8, lines 8-19), hand (see column 6, lines 5-60), head (see Figure 16a-16C and column 9, lines 32-56) and neck (see Figure 19a and column 10, lines 21-32); contacting the magnets directly to the treating regions of the trunk by using a proper band, wrapper or cover with magnets sewn-in or encased in any shape of form appropriate to fit the treating regions of the trunk of a person (see abstract and

Art Unit: 3736

column 8, lines 7-18), but they do not teach a method of treating and alleviating afflictions, ailments and diseases holistically by application of magnetism to a plurality of treating regions of the trunk of a person being treating comprising applying a north pole surface of a magnet to at least one of a plurality of treating regions of the trunk, the magnet having a size of 1/8" x 1/8" to 4"x18" to 13"x43"; maintaining the magnet in contact with at least one of the treating regions of the trunk for a period of 15 to 180 minutes to heal and relieve afflictions, wherein the total flux of the magnetic means applied to the at least one of the treating regions of the trunk being in the range from about $30\Phi - 250,000\Phi$; repeating the application of the magnet for at least one additional period of time; repeating the time period for treatment at least once in a 24 hour period in an interval of about 2-10 hours in accordance with treatment process; applying the magnet to treating regions of the trunk of a person concurrently, wherein a total flux of the magnet applied to the treating regions of the trunk is substantially equal. However, Woo ('569) teaches a method of treating and alleviating pains and inflammation of human afflictions by application of a north pole surface of a magnet to at least one hand of the body of a person being treated comprising steps of maintaining the magnet in contact with said at least one hand for a period of from 30 minutes to about 2 hours to heal and relieve pain, the total flux of the magnetic means applied to at least one hand being in the range from about 5000Φ – 250,000Φ; wherein the total flux of the magnet means applied to each hand is substantially equal. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

the invention to modify the method of treating and alleviating afflictions, ailments and diseases holistically by application of magnetism to a plurality of treating regions of the trunk, hands, head and neck of Lopez et al. ('046) by the method of treating and alleviating pains and inflammation of human afflictions of Woo ('569), since Lopez et al. ('046) teaches the method of treating the human trunk regions using articles of clothing with permanent magnets and Woo ('569) teaches the flux of the magnets required to perform such treatments. Further, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the magnets of Lopez et al. ('046) to use magnets having a size of ½" x ½" to 4"x18" to 13"x43", since it has generally been held to be within the skill level of the art to perform routine experimentation for implementing the magnets as claimed.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed on March 17, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant states that Lopez et al. ('046) utilizes the "Shiatsu" acupressure points and meridian that are being structured differently from the standard one for a purpose of massage practice and do not provide any means of healing or cure; uses the "Shiatsu" acupressure points of the body parts for effecting therapeutic magnetic exposure by wearing magnetic clothing of "T-shirt, brief, pant and glove", etc., which are not based on the balance concept and the standard meridian system. However, Examiner states that Lopez et al.

Art Unit: 3736

('046) teach a merchandise in the form of torso-worn garments provided with a magnetic structure for affecting therapeutic magnetic exposure when worn by a human user (see column 2, lines 32-37), incorporated magnetic structure corresponds to at least three designated regions of a trunk (shiatsu meridian lines), and evenly contacting with at least one of the treating regions of the trunk, spaced apart at an equal distance, in horizontal order all the way around the region (see Figures 12-15). Shiatsu pertains to the massage therapy applied with the fingers to those specific areas of the body used in acupuncture, also termed acupressure. Magnetic healing/therapy is another related practice that has utilized the same specific points on the body known to acupuncture and acupressure practitioners (see column 1, lines 16-25), and thus Examiner assumes that those points are equivalent to the meridian areas (system) Applicant provides in the claims. With regard to the "balance concept" of the Lopez et al. ('046) teaching, the magnetic exposure is believed to assist stressed cells in restoring their correct balance of electrical charge for performing more efficient healing/therapy (see column 1, lines 44-50). Further, Applicant argues that treating regions of Lopez et al. ('046) are not specifically designated, using the body parts of humanwear as treating regions, which do not produce total healing effect of pain relied for whole body concurrently in 15 minutes to 3 hours; contact magnets to the clothing of T-shirts, brief, pants, gloves, etc., is used for effecting therapeutical magnetic exposure against acupressure points, but no specific effectiveness claimed or disclosed. Examiner states that Lopez et al.

Art Unit: 3736

('046) teach therapeutic exposure of the plurality of magnets on selected acupressure (body) regions, and the result of such therapeutic exposure is healing, alleviating afflictions, ailments and diseases. Plurality of magnet means are adapted for application to the plurality of treating regions of the body according to the meridian system (acupressure points) as shown on Figures 1, 2 and 12-15. Further, Applicant agues about "the concept of the energy balance of the human body", but this concept is not in the claimed subject matter. In response to applicant's argument that the contention made by Examiner on "modifying the method of treating of Lopez et al. ('046) by the method of Woo ('569)", and "modifying the magnets of Lopez et al ('046) to use magnets having a size of 1/8" x 1/8" to 4"x18" to 13"x43" is to be incorrect and inappropriate, the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See In re Keller, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981). Applicant's arguing about changes in size and magnets power and flux are moot, since it has generally been held to be within the skill level of the art to perform routine experimentation for implementing the magnets as claimed. Also, Applicant indicated that the use of total flux for the holistic magnetic therapy was disclosed by Woo ('569) in 1987 and by Woo ('429) in 1997, which is 11 years earlier the time of Lopez et al. ('046) of 1998.

Art Unit: 3736

However, Applicant's claimed priority date is June 25, 1996 and the Lopez et al. Application filing date is June 29, 1995.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 3736

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nikita R Veniaminov whose telephone number is (703) 605-0210. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8 A.M.-5 P.M..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eric F Winakur can be reached on (703) 308-3940. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-0758 for regular communications and (703) 308-0758 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0858.

May 05, 2003.

Nikita R Veniaminov Examiner Art Unit 3736

> ERIC F. WINAKUR PRIMARY EXAMINED